

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

RAPHAEL R. CALHOUN,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2:24-cv-3078
Judge James L. Graham
Magistrate Judge Peter B. Silvain, Jr.

JULIE LYNCH, *et al.*,

Defendants.

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the objection of Plaintiff Raphael R. Calhoun, proceeding *pro se*, to the Court's November 5, 2024 Order (ECF No. 26) adopting the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. (ECF No. 25). Because plaintiff has no procedural right to object to the Order (as he did to the Report and Recommendation), the Court will construe his filing as a motion for reconsideration. A party moving to reconsider must show: "(1) a clear error of law; (2) newly discovered evidence; (3) an intervening change in controlling law; or (4) a need to prevent manifest injustice." *Leisure Caviar, LLC v. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Serv.*, 616 F.3d 612, 615 (6th Cir. 2010) (quotation omitted).

Plaintiff has not satisfied this standard. His present objections mention filings made in state court and that "the case is coming to a conclusion for me to pursue relief in the state courts." (ECF No. 28). Plaintiff also makes broad and unsupported claims that constitutional rights have been violated. Ultimately, Plaintiff fails to present new information or show that an intervening change in controlling law merits reconsideration. Plaintiff also does not show that a clear error of law is present or that reconsideration is necessary to prevent manifest injustice.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is **DENIED** (ECF No. 28).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ James L. Graham

JAMES L. GRAHAM
United States District Judge

DATE: March 11, 2025